

1079. C. 11
3

AN
ANSWER
TO THE
LETTER
TO

Dr. WATERLAND. (D)

In Relation to the Point of Circumcision :
Wherein the *Letter-Writer's* Gross Mis-
takes are *Examin'd* and *Confuted*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. CROWNFIELD, at the *Rising-Sun*
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*; and sold by
C. CROWNFIELD, Printer to the University of
Cambridge. M,DCC,XXI.

AK

ANSWER

TO THE

EDITOR

DE WITTE

In Relation to the
of the
to the

THE

By J. J. Crockett, Editor
of the
of the
of the



A N
ANSWER
TO THE
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND*.

S I R,



Have been perusing your *Letter* to Dr. *Waterland*; wherein I perceive you make very free with that Reverend and Learned Divine; first, ascribing a Work to Him which bears not his Name; and, next, pretending to censure him, for opposing the Author of *Christianity as old, &c.* in what relates to *Circumcision*. I shall endeavour

to convince you (if *Truth* and *Reason* will do it) of your Mistakes on that *Subject*, owing perhaps to Haste, or to your having had but very slender Acquaintance with what concerns the *Jewish Talmuds* and *Traditions*: For though you seem to disclaim implicate Belief, and to condemn it in others; yet you make no Scruple of taking upon Trust, the Stories contain'd in **Lightfoot* and †*Spencer*; not searching the Originals, which, if look'd into, might have prevented your Misconceptions, and have set you to Rights.

LIGHTFOOT's Stories (as I shall presently demonstrate to you) would have made for the *Author* of *Scripture Vindicated*, &c. if they had been rightly translated by him from the *Hebrew*, and inserted at full Length.

If any Person would discourse upon any Subject whatever, he ought, I humbly presume, with great Care and Diligence, first to weigh and consider, whether he well understands

* Vol. II. p. 760.

† *De Leg. Heb.* Lib. i. Cap. xiv. *Edit. Cant.*

derstands the Language, and the Matter he takes in hand to discourse upon. I am apt to believe, you are not much acquainted with the *Hebrew* Language, because you have implicitly trusted to others, and have not consulted it, where you ought to have done it : How then can you pretend to be a proper Judge in an Affair of such great Importance ? But I proceed to the Matter in hand ; only first setting down your express Words, as they lie in your Letter.

“ FROM considering the *Origin of Circumcision*, you examine the *Author's Cavils* to the Thing itself, who thinks it strange, *That cutting off the Foreskin (not to be performed without great Pain and Hazard) could have been esteemed a religious Duty, acceptable to a good and gracious God, who makes nothing in vain, much less what requires cutting off, even with extreme Danger and Anguish.**

“ IN answer to this : As to the *Pain* of the Operation, you represent it as *slight* and
“ *inconsi-*

“ *inconsiderable, and make no more of cut-*
 “ *ting off the Foreskin, than the Navel-*
 “ *String in Infants so young.** And as to
 “ the *Hazard* of it, you condemn the very
 “ Thought, and jeeringly call upon him for
 “ *a List of such as had ever died of it.* And
 “ here I cannot but expect, that he will return
 “ your own Compliment upon you: What?
 “ *No Genius for Literature! No Acquain-*
 “ *tance with common Criticks and Commenta-*
 “ *tors!* For the commonest of them all would
 “ have informed you, that the *Pain of Cir-*
 “ *cumcision* was not only very *acute and*
 “ *grievous,* but the *Hazard* of it too so
 “ great, that it often proved *mortal.* *Spencer,*
 “ in the Words of *Maimonides,* tells us,
 “ That it was not like a *slight Hurt of the*
 “ *Leg, or Burning of the Arm; but a most*
 “ *harsh and dangerous Thing, not to be un-*
 “ *dergone without some Hazard of Life.†*
 “ And *Lightfoot* informs us, that the *fre-*
 “ *quent Mortality* it occasioned, produced a
 “ *standing*

* Page 64.

† Nam non est levis aliqua cruris lesio vel brachii adustio, sed res durissima & difficillima, nec sine vitæ discrimine quandoque subeunda. De Leg. Heb. Lib. i. Cap. xiv.

“ *standing Law*, that when any Person had
 “ *lost three Children successively by the Ope-*
 “ *ration, he was to be excused from cir-*
 “ *cumcising the rest; in consequence of which*
 “ *there were actually many uncircumcised*
 “ *among them, who, in those Circumstances,*
 “ *were esteemed still to be, in all Points,*
 “ *as good Israelites, and even as perfect*
 “ *Priests, as any of the rest.* This per-
 “ haps will startle you, who have talked
 “ so rashly on a Subject you were not
 “ acquainted with; and you will be the
 “ more surpriz’d to find a *Positive Precept*
 “ suspended by human Authority for civil
 “ and temporal Ends; yet you will scarce
 “ except to my Author, who was both
 “ learned and orthodox; and to him I shall
 “ refer you for the *List* you *insultingly*
 “ call for, of those who had died by the O-
 “ *peration.** As

* “ You will wonder, Reader, to hear that some *Jews*
 “ were always uncircumcised; yea, that some Priests
 “ not circumcised administred at the Altar; and that
 “ without the Complaint of any, and, indeed, without
 “ any Fault. — Very frequent Mention is made in
 “ the *Talmudists* of an uncircumcised *Israelite*, and
 “ an uncircumcised Priest. — If the first, second,
 “ third Son should die by Circumcision, those that
 “ were born after were not circumcised; and yet *Israe-*
 “ *lites* in all Respects; Priests in all Respects.” *Lights*.
 Vol. ii. p. 760.

" As to the other Part of the *Cavil*, that
 " God does nothing in vain; you answer,
 " that the *Foreskin* was not made in vain;
 " that in ordinary Cases it was better to
 " have it on, than off; but for extraordi-
 " nary, it was wisely contrived, that there
 " might be something to spare, something
 " to cut off, as Occasion should require.* A
 " most admirable Solution; which amounts
 " just to this; that had not God wisely pro-
 " vided it, he could never have order'd it
 " to be cut off.

" In the case of *Circumcision*, instead of
 " shewing your Adversary's Ignorance, you
 " have betray'd your own; by denying that
 " to be painful or hazardous, which, for
 " the Pain of it, was often mortal; nor al-
 " lowing the least Colour of Reason to an
 " Objection grounded in Probability, and
 " confirmed by express Testimony.†

Now, good Sir, I must take Leave to
 tell you, that you have said a great deal to

* Page 6y.

† Page 33, 34, 35, 47, 48.

no Purpose or Effect at all, and might as well have spared your Labour in quoting *Spencer* and *Lightfoot*. It is a great Pity, and I commiserate your Misfortune, especially since you set up for a *learned Man*, and well acquainted with the *Rabins*,* that you did not search the Originals. For,

FIRST, I would fain know, how you came to trust to *Spencer's* Quotation, *that the Pain of Circumcision was not only acute and grievous, but the Hazard of it too so great, that it often proved mortal.* To prove which, you bring your twice-borrow'd Evidence from *Spencer*, who says, that *it was not like a slight Hurt of the Leg, or Burning of the Arm, &c. not to be undergone without some Hazard of Life.* But I must tell you, for your better Information, that *Maimonides* was too pious a *Jew*, to make such a gross Reflection on the Command of God, who would not have ordain'd it, if it had been of such dangerous Consequence as *Spencer*, and you, ignorantly copying from him, pretend to make it. The all-wise God well knew that his peculiar

Blessed People

* Letter, Page 21.

People the *Hebrews*, were sufficiently able to endure the Operation. If *Maimonides* had said, as you would have him, he would then have contradicted what he says in his *Chapters of Circumcision*, when he observes, that even in dangerous *Distempers*, if not mortal, *circumcise forthwith*, &c. as I shall presently demonstrate to you.

BUT you appear so very ignorant in the Affair of *Circumcision*; and so little to be trusted, that you have not only misrepresented *Maimonides*, but even *Spencer* too.

I. YOU have not truly translated *Spencer* into *English*; which, if rightly rendered, ought to have stood thus. *Was sometimes not to be undergone without Hazard of Life.** But you say, *was not to be undergone without some Hazard of Life*. And this is a plain Mistake of yours, though slight in Comparison.

* *Sed res durissima & difficillima, nec sine vita discrimine quandoque subeunda. Spen. de Leg. Heb.*

II. SPENCER has given us a Translation very different from the Words, and the true Intent and Meaning of *Maimonides*, altering the Sense of that Passage. The Place should have been thus rendered: No Man ought to perform Circumcision on himself, or on his Sons, but in an upright Faith: Let it not be unto him as a Scratch of the Leg, or a Burn on the Arm: But let it be unto him as a very difficult Task, whereby it might be known, that he doth it out of great Love.* Not a Word of Hazard of Life! This is quite different from you or *Spencer*: Here the Thing is obvious, and almost speaks itself, viz. That no Man should make flight of Circumcision, but esteem it as the greatest Precept that God had instituted: So that you might well have spared your Labour in quoting *Spencer* for your Author; who has himself very widely mistaken the Point, and has added an Inference of his own to *Maimonides's* Words, which the Words themselves afford no Foundation: For you did not observe, that the Words & *difficillima*

B 2

are

המילה לא יעשה אדם בו או בבניו רק מתוך אמונה אמיתית כי
אין זה שום בשוק או ביה בודע אבל ענין שיהיה קשה מאוד וידוע
גם כן דבר האהבה * Maim. More Neb. H. 3. C. 49.

are *Bumorf's*, and the rest *neo sine vitæ discrimine quandoque subeunda*, were *Spencer's* own; and not the Words of *Maimonides*.

SECONDLY, You are grossly mistaken in reporting, as from *Lightfoot*, that the frequent Mortality by Circumcision produced a standing Law, that when any Person had lost three Children successively by the Operation, he was to be excused from circumcising the rest, &c. Is this Ingenuity, Honesty, or Truth, to quote Words that are not found in your Author, who speaks not a Syllable of a standing Law among The Jewish Divines? But what *Lightfoot* speaks on this Matter is only producing *Rabby Jochanan*, (not by his own Authority, but by Hear-say) in the Name of *Rabby Benaiah*, who says, that it is permitted to sprinkle upon an uncircumcised Israelite.* But at the Conclusion of this Discourse in the *Talmud*, he speaks quite to the contrary. *Rabby Aben* says, It is agreed on all Sides, that it is not permitted to sprinkle on the Uncircumcised.†

Here

* *Talmud.* רב יוחנן בשם רבי בנאי ישראל עול מין עליו
Hieruf. p. 36. col. 2.
 † *Ibid.* אמר רב אבהו מכל מקום לא מן הנהו לערלים

Here you plainly see, that they all mutually agree in confronting your false Report taken from *Lightfoot*. Where is there now any Objection, or any Room left for Cavil? Or, to use your own Words, *How can you talk so rashly on a Subject you were not acquainted with*, not understanding the Nature of *Talmudick Disputations*? Besides, the *Babylonick Talmud* (which is much more esteemed and studied among the *Jews*, for its Acuracy and Consistency, than the *Jerusalem Talmud**) positively denies the same; for *Raba* says, *An uncircumcised Priest that sprinkles on an uncircumcised Priest; and also an uncircumcised Priest that sprinkles on an uncircumcised Israelite, is guilty of Caroth, i. e. to be cut off from his People.*† Neither uncircumcised Priest, nor uncircumcised *Israelite*, were permitted even to enter the Temple, much less to officiate or minister. There never was any such Thing heard of as an uncircumcised Priest, or uncircumcised *Israelite*, (in your Sense) among the *Jews*, as I shall prove by-and-by: And *Lightfoot* mistook the real Meaning of the Quotation,

* *Basnage's Hist. of the Jews*, B. iii. C. vi. Sect. iv.

† *Pesachim*, p. 84. אמר רבא כהן ערל שחזה וכו' חייב כרת

Quotation, by not considering the Nature of the Thing expressed in the *Talmud*.

CIRCUMCISION was instituted out of the great Love of God to *Abraham* and his Seed; which was for a Sign of his Covenant with them, that the *Israelites* might thereby be called his peculiar People; and whosoever was not circumcised in the *Foreskin*, *that Soul shall be cut off*.^{*} Therefore *Maimonides*, in his *Chapters of Circumcision* collected from the *Talmud*, says, "He that destroys the Covenant of our Father *Abraham*, and is not circumcised in his Fore- skin, though he be full of Divinity, and he be endued with Righteousness, he has no Share in the World to come.[†]" Again, "Behold how urgent and pressing Circum- cision is! that not one Hour's Delay was granted to *Moses* our Teacher.[‡]" Here we find no such Thing as an uncircumcised Person allow'd to be among the *Jews*.

THIRDLY,

^{*} *Exod.* xvii. 14.

[†] *Maimon.* c. iii. כל המפד בריחו של אברהם אבינו והניח ערלתו אף על פי שיש בו תורה ומעשים טובים אין לו חלק לעולם הבא

[‡] *Ibid.* c. iii. בא וראה כמה חמורה מילה שלא תחלה למשה רבינו עליה אפילו שעה אחת

THIRDLY, But perhaps you'll say, that the Story about *Rabby Nathan* and *Rabby Eleazer*, in *Lightfoot*, is sufficient to demonstrate, that though they were uncircumcised, yet they were *Israelites in all Respects*, *Priests in all Respects*, as you say, but not *Lightfoot*. And here again you discover your Ignorance, by copying from *Lightfoot*, who has told the Story by Halves, and has not favoured us with the whole Tale, as it stands in his Author. For the Story of *Rabby Nathan*, in the *Jerusalem Talmud*, infers no such Thing as you fondly imagine, from the Scrap you had seen of it in *English* only. Therefore, for your fuller Instruction, I will here present you with the entire Story; which (to use your own Words) *perhaps will startle you*: For, says *Rabby Nathan*, "It happen'd once that I went to *Cesaria* of *Cappadocia*, and a certain Woman being there, who had several Children that were circumcised, and died: She circumcised the first, and it died; the second, and it died; the third, and it died: She brought the fourth to me, and I searched him, and I did not see in him the

" Blood

“ Blood of the Covenant : I said to her, let
 “ him tarry a little after the Time, (a little
 “ after the eighth Day,) and she did let him
 “ tarry ; and I circumcised him, and he sur-
 “ viv'd; and I called him *Nathan*, as my
 “ Name is.*” This is vastly different from
 what you or *Lightfoot* relate: For the Child
 was notwithstanding circumcised ; and fo
 your pretended *standing Law*, that the
fourth Child, in such a Case, was to go
 without Circumcision, is confuted by the ve-
 ry Instance brought to prove it.

THIS Story is better related in the *Baby-
 lonian Talmud*, where *Rabby Nathan* speaks
 concerning the Distemper the Child had ; that
 after the fourth Child was brought to him, he
 says, “ I perceived his Countenance was
 “ very ghastly : I said unto her, Tarry a
 “ little 'till he recovers, which she did ; and
 I cir-

* *Talmud Hierus.* p. 7. col. 4. *Tract. Jabamoth.*
 תני אמר רבי נתן מעשה שהלכתי לקיסרין של קפוטקין והיתה
 שם אשה אחת והיתה ילדה זכרים והיו נפולים ומתים ומלת הראשון
 ומת שני ומת שלישי ומת רביעי הביאתו לפני נסתבלתי בו ול
 ראיתי בו דם ברית אמרתי לה הניחיהו לאחר זמן והניחיהו ומלוחו
 ונמצא בן קיימא וקראתי אותו נתן בשמי

"I circumcised him," &c.* And now is this the great Argument of you and *Light-foot*, that many *Jews* were permitted, though uncircumcised? There is no such Thing mention'd in this Story. This plainly proves, that this poor ignorant Woman (if the Story be true, and not a Fiction) imagined, that she might not tarry above the eighth Day, ordain'd by God for Circumcision; and perhaps, there was none but herself in the Place where she dwelt, to circumcise her Children; and she was not acquainted with the Rule which *Maimonides* collected from the *Talmud*, who says; "The Sick, whose Distemper is very dangerous, do not circumcise him, till he somewhat recovers; but in ordinary Distempers, circumcise forthwith.†" It is very plain, from the *Babylonian Talmud*, that her Child was very sick and weak, either in a *Fever*, or such like dangerous Distemper, when *Rabby Nathan* came to her; and so he desired her to tarry a little while; and

ראיתי שהיה ידוק אמרתי לה המתיני עד שיפול לו דמיו ומלה אחת
וקרין שמו נתן * *Talmud. Babyl. Tract. Sabb. p. 134.*
הולה אין מלין אותו עד שיבריא במה דברים אמורים בשחלשון
המחזיקים בחוליו והלך שאין בו חולי שסכנת נפשות רוחה את הכל

* *Maimon: de Circumcis. c. i.*

he afterwards circumcised the Child, and it surviv'd: For so *Rabby Nathan* positively tells us, That she should tarry a little after the Time, viz. a little after the eighth Day.

As for the Story of *Rabby Eleazer*, I shall consider it when I treat on the Signification of an *uncircumcised Priest*, and an *uncircumcised Israelite*.

AND here, again, I must blame you for quoting Words that *Lightfoot* never wrote, in saying, "That if the first, second, third Son should die by Circumcision, those that were born after were not circumcised; and yet *Israelites* in all Respects, Priests in all Respects.*". This, I presume, is taken from *Maimonides*, in his *Chapters of Circumcision*. *Lightfoot* has also mistaken the Matter: For that Eminent and Learned *Few* says, "A Woman who hath circumcised her first Son, and it died by Circumcision, being very weak and sick; and also, if she hath circumcised the second, and it died; she must not circumcise

“ eise the third in his Time, (on the eighth
 “ Day,) but let her wait, ’till he waxeth,
 “ and gathereth a little Strength.*” No
 doubt but *Rabby Nathan* grounded his Story
 upon this Quotation, (if it is not a Fiction)
 being so near a Resemblance of it. And it
 is customary for the *Talmud* to relate a Fact,
 when they treat of a Precept: The *Talmud*
 is full of such. But here is not a Word of
Priest in all Respects; Israelites in all Re-
spects: Neither does *Lightfoot* speak in the
 Manner as you do.

FOURTHLY, It was unlawful for an *uncir-*
cumcised Priest, or *uncircumcised Israelite*,
 even to enter the Temple, much more to
 sprinkle or Sacrifice. I will also demonstrate
 to you the true Signification of an *uncircum-*
cised Priest, and an *uncircumcised Israelite*.

1. To prove that it was unlawful for an
 uncircumcised Person to enter the Temple,
 much more to *sprinkle* or *sacrifice*, the fa-

C 2

mous

אשה שמלה בנה ראשון ומת מחמת מילה שהכשילה את כחו וכן אם
 מלה השני ומת למל השלישי בזמנו אלמ יסתן עד שגדיל ויתחוק

* *Maimon. C. i.* בנה

he afterwards circumcised the Child, and it *surviv'd*: For so *Rabby Nathan* positively tells us, That she should *tarry a little after the Time, viz.* a little after the eighth Day.

As for the Story of *Rabby Eleazer*, I shall consider it when I treat on the Signification of an *uncircumcised Priest*, and an *uncircumcised Israelite*.

AND here, again, I must blame you for quoting Words that *Lightfoot* never wrote, in saying, " That if the first, second, " third Son should die by Circumcision, " those that were born after were not circum- " cised ; and yet *Israelites* in all Respects, " Priests in all Respects.*". This, I presume, is taken from *Maimonides*, in his *Chapters of Circumcision*. *Lightfoot* has also mistaken the Matter : For that Eminent and Learned *Jew* says, " A Woman who " hath circumcised her first Son, and it died " by Circumcision, being very weak and " sick ; and also, if she hath circumcised the " second, and it died ; she must not circum- cise

“ eise the third in his Time, (on the eighth Day,) but let her wait, ’till he waxeth, and gathereth a little Strength.*” No doubt but *Rabby Nathan* grounded his Story upon this Quotation, (if it is not a Fiction) being so near a Resemblance of it. And it is customary for the *Talmud* to relate a Fact, when they treat of a Precept: The *Talmud* is full of such. But here is not a Word of *Priest in all Respects; Israelites in all Respects*: Neither does *Lightfoot* speak in the Manner as you do.

FOURTHLY, It was unlawful for an *uncircumcised Priest*, or *uncircumcised Israelite*, even to enter the Temple, much more to sprinkle or Sacrifice. I will also demonstrate to you the true Signification of an *uncircumcised Priest*, and an *uncircumcised Israelite*.

1. To prove that it was unlawful for an uncircumcised Person to enter the Temple, much more to *sprinkle* or *sacrifice*, the fa-

C 2

mous

אשה שמלה בנה ראשון ומת מחמת מלה שהכשילה את כחו וכן אם
מלה השני ומת מל מול השלישי בזמנו אלה ימתן עד שיגדיל ויחזק

* *Maimon. C. i.* בן

meous Rabby *David Kimchi*, says, "The
 " Uncircumcised in the Foreskin are abomi-
 " nable before the blessed God, and must
 " not presume to minister before the Lord;
 " and are estranged from ministering in the
 " Temple, as well as those who are uncir-
 " cumcised in Heart, and uncircumcised
 " in Flesh,*" Also that Eminent Teacher
 among the Jews, *Rav Chisda*, says, "Where
 " is it inserted, that the Uncircumcised shall
 " not enter the Temple? We have it from
 " *Ezek. xlv. 9. No Stranger, uncircumcised*
 " *in Heart, or uncircumcised in Flesh, shall*
 " *enter into my Sanctuary, &c.* much less the
 " uncircumcised in the Foreskin.†" And
 here I must take Notice, that none were per-
 mitted to enter the Temple, &c. even such
 as were circumcised in the Foreskin, if they
 were not circumcised in the *Heart and Flesh*,
 (which Phrase, I shall presently explain to
 you) much less officiate, or minister. They
 must

הערלה היא מאוסה לפני השם ותבודד ולא יכול לשרת לפני השם
 ושניהם נזרים לעבודת בית המקדש ערל לב וערל בשר

* *Kimchi ad Ezek. xlv. 9.*

ערל מן אבר רב חסד כל בן נבי ערל לב וערל בשר לא יבא
 אל מקדש לשרתני. *Talmud, Tract. Zebachim. C. 2. p. 22.*

must be reputed pious and virtuous Persons: The Uncircumcised were always, and are at present, among the modern Jews, esteemed as an Abomination. The Learned *Maimonides* says, "It is unlawful for a Jew to eat" or to drink with the Uncircumcised.* Had you, good Sir, known this, you would not have censured the Author of *Scripture Vindicated*. This is quite different from what you and Dr. *Lightfoot* say concerning an *uncircumcised Priest*, and an *uncircumcised Israelite*. There are four Kinds of uncircumcised Persons, spoken of in the *Talmud* and Traditions of the Jews, as well as in *Scripture*.

1. Uncircumcised in Lips, *Exod. vi. 12.*
2. Uncircumcised in Ears, *Jerem. vi. 10.*
3. Uncircumcised in Heart, *Deut. x. 16.*
4. Uncircumcised in Flesh, *Gen. xvii. 10.*†

As to the two last of them, the Prophet says, *In that ye have brought into my Sanctuary Strangers uncircumcised in Heart, and uncir-*

* *Maimon. Tract. Idol.* אמור לאכול ולאשתות עם חקרים

† See *Buxtorf. Lexic. Talmud.* on the Word חרל *Harol.*

*uncircumcised in Flesh.** And I have already proved, that they were not allow'd to enter the Temple ; and these were called *uncircumcised Priests*, and *uncircumcised Israelites* : So say *Abarvanel* and *Tarchi* on the Place. And if these Priests should *sprinkle*, they are guilty of *Caroth*, to be cut off from their People.†

THE *Talmud* is very plain, as to what the Prophet says : *For all these Nations are uncircumcised ; and all the House of Israel are uncircumcised in Heart.‡* “ Though they “ be circumcised, (says *Rabby Nissim*) yet “ are called Uncircumcised.”|| Here it is plain that *Lightfoot* mistook the Phrase, imagining that *כהן ערל* *Cohen Harol*, &c. was a Priest uncircumcised in the *Foreskin*. The *Talmud* and *Traditions* flatly contradict it : For, speaking of the Passover, that *no uncircumcised Person shall eat thereof,*** *Tarchi*

* *Jerem. ix. 26.*

† *Talmud. Babyl. Tract. Pesachim*, p. 84.

‡ *Ezek. xlv. 7.*

|| *Talmud. Babyl. Mishna ult.* אפילו מולם מקרים ערלים

** *Exod. xii. 48.*

Tarchi says, "Though he be no Apostate
" to Circumcision, yet he shall not eat there-
" of;" much less (may I add) to enter the
Temple, or to minister.

BUT what surprizes me most, is, how it
came to pass, that Dr. *Lightfoot* should mis-
take so grossly the Sense of the *Mishna*, and
make it perfect Nonsense, when he speaks
of an *uncircumcised Priest lamenting*, &c.*
for if it were translated, as it is in the *Mishna*,
it would have run in *English* thus: " All
" the Sacrifices whose Blood has been re-
" ceived by a Stranger, or by a Priest la-
" menting; †" that is, When a Father, Mo-
ther, Brother, Sister, or Child of a Priest dies,
the Priest is polluted till his Dead is buried,
and he must bath himself before he enters
the Temple. Here is not one Word of an
uncircumcised Priest lamenting: A Thing
never known among the *Jews*: For *Mai-*
monides expressly says, in his *Chapters of*
Circumcision, " All Precepts may be suspend-

ed,

* *Lightf.* Vol. ii. p. 760.

† *Zebachim*. c. ii. *Mish.* ii. כל הזבחים שקבלו דמן זר אונן וכו'

ed, excepting that of *Circumcision*.[†]
 And as I have already inform'd you, "That
 " he that destroys the Covenant of our Fa-
 " ther *Abraham*, and is not circumcised in
 " the Foreskin, &c. has no Share in the
 " World to come.†" The Uncircumcised
 were abominable before God; they dare not
 enter the Temple, much less minister before
 the Altar, as I have already sufficiently
 proved, and have quoted good Authority for it.
 It is agreed, "That the Uncircumcised in the
 " Foreskin are abominable, &c. and are e-
 " stranged from ministering in the Temple, as
 " well as those who are *uncircumcised in*
 " *Heart*, and *uncircumcised in Flesh*.†"
 Hence it is plain what an uncircumcised Priest,
 and an uncircumcised *Israelite*, sometimes sig-
 nify; they are the wicked Priests, the wick-
 ed *Israelites*; those that swerve and re-
 bel against the divine Laws of God, who
 walk not in the right Path, as *Tartbi* says on
Ezek. xlv. 7. and most of the *Jewish Com-*
mentators.

Dr.

* *Maimon. C. iii*† *Ibid.*

† See Page 20.

Dr. LIGHTFOOT speaks well, when he gives us an Account, that the *Talmud* says on the Verse, *Ye shall live by them; and not die by them*: But this is spoken on different Occasions, that no Man shall endanger his Life by strictly adhering to the Precepts of God; as too much fasting; to save his Friend from Danger, where his own Life should lay at Stake, &c.* It may be also applied to Circumcision; not to circumcise a Child, or Person, that is very weak and infirm, whose Life might be endanger'd thereby; it was permitted them to tarry 'till they should somewhat recover, as I have before observed.

LIGHTFOOT might have imagined, that from the three following modern Institutions of the *Rabbies*, concerning Circumcision, those were called Uncircumcised, who did not observe them. But this does not concern the Author of *Scripture Vindicated*: He was only to defend the Ordinances of God, but not of Man; and it appears plain to me, that *Lightfoot*, by his References, did imagine so.

FIRST, They have a Ceremony called *Priah*, פריעה which signifies a strict *Denu-*
D *dation*,

* See *Tarchi*, *Kimchi*, *Eben Ezra*, upon the Place.

dation of the Part. Let us see what the *Talmud* and *Traditions* say to this, and how far they approve or disapprove of that Ceremony. The *Mishna* says, "If one circumcises, and does not פָּרַע *denudate* the Prepuce, it is as if he were not circumcised.*" Again, "These are the פִּיטְיִם *Frugments*, which hinders Circumcision: If the Flesh covers *majorem partem coronæ*, such Person cannot eat of the תְּרוּמָה *Thruma*, or Oblation." That is, says *Rasbi*, if he be a Priest. The *Gloss* on the *Talmud* contradicts it, and says, "What need is there for all this, if the Prepuce be cut off." And *Ran* (who was the נָשִׁי *Nassi*, or Prince, in the Time of the *Talmud*) says, "This פְּרִיעָה *Denudation* was given to our Father Abraham;†" by which it is to be understood, it was not of divine Institution: So that it is unnecessary. *Basnage*, who perfectly understood the Ceremonies of the Jews, speaks not one Word about it.* This *second Circumcision* might perhaps mislead

Light-

* *Sabb.* p. 137. מל ופָּרַע כְּאֵלֶּי לֹא מֵחַ
אֵלֶּיָּהּ. צִוָּה הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת הַמִּלֵּה בְּשֹׁר הַחֹפֶה הַזֶּה הַעֲטֵרָה אֲנִי
אֵלֶּי בְּתֵרֹמָה

† *Mishna Sabb.* p. 137.

‡ *Tal. Bab. Tract. } אמר רב לא נתנה פְּרִיעָה לאברהם אבינו*
Jabam. p. 71.

* *Basnage*, Book v. p. 420.

Lightfoot, who finding that this has been sometimes represented as dangerous, might unwarily apply it to the *first* Circumcision, as if that were also equally dangerous; when the Cases are widely different.

SECONDLY, They say that one who lets the *Preputium* grow together again, which is called *משך* *Masbuch*, requires a *second Circumcision*. The *Jerusalem Talmud* tells us a Story, to prove it of no dangerous Consequence at all, (though this also of human Institution) who says, " That *Masbuch* ought
 " not to be circumcised, that he may not be
 " in danger; so says *Rabby Jehuda*: But
 " *Rabby Josoa* said unto him, there were
 " many *Masbuchs* in the Days of *Ben Co-*
 " *zeba* [the pretended Messiah] and all of
 " them were circumcised, and lived, and be-
 " gat Sons and Daughters.*" This *second Circumcision* is not used among the modern *Jews*: And from hence the *Talmud* speaks of an *uncircumcised Priest*, and an *uncircumcised Israelite*, if they had not this *second Circumcision*.

D 2

LASTLY,

המושך לא ימול שלא יבא לידי סכנה דברי רבי יהודה אמר לו
 רבי יוסף הדבא משוכן היה בימי בן כוזבא וכו' מלך היה חוליד
 בנים ובנות * *Talmud. Hierus. Tract. Jebamoth. c. viii.*

LASTLY, *Tarchi* and *Bartenora*, both modern Commentators, speak of a *Priest whose Brethren die by Circumcision*,* that *Priest shall not eat of the Thruma*, &c. that is, whose Brethren die of the second Circumcision, either by the פריעה *Denudation*, or by משוך letting the *Preputium* grow together again; which is plainly demonstrated in the *Talmud*, that it meant of the *second Circumcision*,† instituted by human Authority: And as I have already proved, that it is contradicted by the *Rabbies*, and we have no Precedent of a Fact related in the *Talmud*, of any one that died by the first Circumcision instituted by divine Authority, except the Children of the ignorant Woman, as I have already told you; therefore had the Author of *Scripture Vindicated* quoted the *Talmud* for his Authority, he would then, instead of vindicating the pure Text of Scripture, have raised Scruples and Objections against it, by Reason of the manifest Contradictions that are in the *Talmud*; though *Lightfoot* mistook the different Phrases of the *Talmud*, and jumbled them all together; which has occasioned me to set him to Rights again.

THUS

* *Jabamoth*. c. viii. *Mishna*. i. *Sabb*. p. 137. in *Mishna*,

† *Ibid*.

THUS hath *Lightfoot* mistaken the Matter ; and you, by taking them at *second Hand*, have of course committed Blunders. Not one Quotation concerning Circumcision in *Lightfoot* is rightly translated from the *Hebrew* into the *Englisb*. There was no such Thing ever heard of, as an *uncircumcised Priest*, or *Israelite* uncircumcised in the Foreskin ; but the *Talmud* only speaks, either of the *Uncircumcised*, as wanting this *second Circumcision*, or of those who were uncircumcised in *Heart* and *Flesh* ;* of the wicked Priests and *Israelites* : And of the latter was the Priest who *sprinkled*, &c. as *Rabby Lazar*, (by Hearsay) in the Name of *Rabby Hanninah* informs us.†

AND, as I have already informed you, the Uncircumcised were not permitted to enter the Temple, upon any Occasion whatever ; those were equally abominable, according to the true Intent and Meaning of the Scripture, that were *uncircumcised in Heart*, &c. And this is the true Signification of an *uncircumcised Priest*, and an *uncircumcised Israelite* ; who are to this Day reputed as Heathens among the *Jews*.

Now,

* See Page 22.

† *Lightfoot* Vol. ii. p. 769.

Now, Sir, what is become of your Argument against the Author of *Scripture Vindicated*? You see there is no Foundation in the least for your quoting *Lightfoot* for your Authority.

LASTLY, the *Talmud* and *Traditions* nowhere mention, that Circumcision is a dangerous or hazardous Operation, *not to be performed without great Pain or Hazard,** &c. but the contrary; for *Maimonides* says, "It is permitted to circumcise with any Thing; be it with a Flint, or Glass, or any Thing that cutteth; because there is no Danger.†" This plainly shews there could not ordinarily be any Danger whatever in the Operation. *Maimonides* would not have said, that it was permitted to circumcise with *Flint* or *Glass*, when all the World knows, one that is wounded with either of them is not so easy to be cured, as one wounded with Iron, or any other Metal. And well and truly hath the Author of *Scripture Vindicated* represented it, as slight and inconsiderable; *no more perhaps, than the cutting the Navel-String,‡* and justly

* Page 33.

ובכל מלך ואפילו בצור ובחבובית ובכל דבר שבורח מפני שאין בו

‡ De Circumcis. c. i. סכנה

‡ Page 64.

ly doth he call on the Author of *Christianity as old, &c.* to produce a *List of such as had ever died of it.*

I HAVE made it my Business to enquire among the *Jews*, whether any Person or Child ever died of the Operation, and how long Time it took up before the Wound was healed. To the *First*, they said, There was no such Thing as any Person, or Child, dying under the Operation: Yea, many have come from *Spain* and *Portugal*, and have been circumcised at the Age of *Sixty*, or *Seventy*, and have never died of it. *Secondly*, As to the Time it took, before the Wound was healed up, was four Days at farthest; some Children the second Day; and, it has been frequently observed, that some of these little Infants, when they are circumcised, do not even cry at the Operation. In short, no such Instance as Children dying under the Operation, was ever known among the *Jews*, except the Story of *Rabby Nathan* in *Lightfoot*: And that poor ignorant Woman was the Occasion of her Infants Deaths by her Unskilfulness; or the Children before were dying of a dangerous Distemper, as is related in the *Babylonian Talmud*. So we plainly perceive no Danger in the

the Operation. It was therefore needless for the Author of *Scripture Vindicated*, to bring Quotations from the *Talmud* or *Traditions*, when no Mention is made in them of the Operation being *painful* or *hazardous*. His Business was only to vindicate the pure Text, he has sufficient Reason not to be too prolix; few Words are always best, when few will suffice.

To conclude; As you have spent abundance of Pains about nothing, for you have prov'd nothing, and have taken the Liberty to abuse Dr. *Waterland*, or the Author of *Scripture Vindicated*, in a most ungentlemanlike Manner, upon false Grounds, and unsupported Evidences, poring in the Dark, talking you knew not *what*, and censuring you knew not *why*; be advis'd, for the future, whenever you sit down to write upon any Matter of Importance, to have a strict Regard to *Truth*, and to take nothing at *second hand*, lest you expose yourself, as you have now done in the present Subject: For, to return your own Compliment upon you, there is *not a Scrap of Reason, or Sense in it*.

I am, &c.

F I N I S.